

From: Peer Swan
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2005 4:12 PM
To: Dabbs, Paul
Subject: California Water Plan comments

From a policy maker point of view the graphic display of the sources and uses found in the Highlights on Page 2 and elsewhere in the several volume should be modified as follows:

1. The amounts of each component should be printed. The cylinder displayed amount can be misread depending if you measure from the middle or edge.
2. The Wet Year source amount displayed in the graphic does not include runoff. Runoff being water that is not evaporated or transporated. This amount should be included as instream environmental. Total sources should be greater that 200 MAF not 94.5 as shown. The lower figure is very misleading and does not properly reflect the large swings in the California usable water supply.
3. The graphic should use shades of green to portray the "Wild and Scenic River" and Managed Environmental" amount in the use part of the graphic.

State Summary, Volume 3, Table 1-2, page 1-17 and elsewhere in the report should identify total precipitation less ET to figure usable in State water supply (adjusted for inflows and outflows) for each type year. Ag uses should be the consumptive uses (basically the ET amount). Urban should be the same consumptive ET use including the consumptive use of recycled water. The 186.3 MAF number in the 1998 column is too big and should be broken down into several components. It looks like it is basically ET where in fact a large component is runoff (again to another salt sink). The fact that we allow huge amount to runoff to the Pacific Ocean during wet and normal years should not be concealed from policy makers.

Numerous tables should be reformatted to display data in the various volumes in a similar fashion.

There should be a recommendation to the legislature that the State conduct a Non Site specific study of the amount of surface and sub-surface storage needed to maximize the State's water supply. The results would frame the possibilities available to policy makers absent any other constraints. This info will be especially important if the forecast of continued global warming is correct and we loose a significant part of the winter snow pact that currently provides significant effective storage and is responsible for the current Projects yields.

There could have been a recommendation that a target be established for each urban water retailer (using landsat photos and census data). If commercial and industrial use is omitted and ET date approximated, we could quickly see would is doing a good job and who not so attention could be correctly focused on those needing improvement.

No recommendation is there for protecting those conserving retailers who have hardened their demand from across the board percentage reductions during extended droughts. The unfairness of the current situation prevents many from seriously pursuing conservation.

The B 160 Recommendations are too general. Policy leaders need more specific recommendations.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely yours,

Peer Swan

Director
Irvine Ranch Water District (26 years)